

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patient and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usefu.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,210	08/26/2003	Brian Scott Hallisey	200206455-1	1934
11077	7590 02/08/2007 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 2724	00, 3404 E. HARMON	AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TORT GOLDI	15, 65 552, 2155	2179		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 02/08/2007		02/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/647,210	HALLISEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas Augustine	2179	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by so - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a b. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tatute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	?6 August 2003.		
·— ·	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und	·	· •	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers	• .	•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 8/26/2003 is/are: a		to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to		•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bu	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.	
		•	
Attachment(s)			
1) 🔯 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	——,	

Art Unit: 2179

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).
- 3. Claims 1 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jong et al (US 7,107534 B1).

As for independent claim 1, Jong teaches a method of using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system, the method

Art Unit: 2179

comprising: illustrating at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies in the same mosaic-like graphic (figure 14-15 and col.10, line 8), each hierarchy representing one or more of the relationships amongst the resources (figure 14).

As for independent claim 18, Jong teaches a method of displaying relationships amongst first, second and third types of resources of a system (figures 14 and 15), the method comprising: preparing a graphic of at least two separate but overlapping hierarchies such that viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type ("Host Waterloo") report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type (wherein depicted in figure 13 (in relation to figure 12, the hierarchy of the enterprise) the subsystems "Compaq K104" and "Digital Z3" report hierarchically to the subsystems "ones" of the second resource type "Host Another"; col.9, lines 45 and 55-60)), and viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type ("Host YetAnother"; figures 14 and 15 col.10, lines 14-16); and displaying the graphic (figure 13).

As for dependent claims 19-22, Jong teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the graphic is mosaic-like (figure 13); wherein each of the first, second and third resources is represented as an iconic element of the mosaic-like graphic (figure 13); wherein the first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies represents physical storage

resources of a storage system (figure 13), and the second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies represents logical storage resources of the storage system (figure 15); wherein the second direction is opposite to the first direction (col.9, lines 55-60 and col.10, lines 8-16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2179

6. Claims 2-17, 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kanevsky et al (US 6,426,761 B1) in view of Jong et al (US 7,107534 B1).

As for claims 2, 3, 6-17, 23 and 24 Jong teaches the method of claim 1 (note the

above analysis), wherein said resources are represented by icons and at least one resource occupies a rank in at least two of said overlapping but separate hierarchies (figures 14-15, wherein figure 14 shows a rank or heritage of the icons) Jong does not specifically mention that an icon can change size by system or user, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky teaches further comprising: sizing said icons in proportion to said at least one attribute of said represented resource (col.4, lines 14, 31, 38, 44,-46 and 51); wherein said at least one attribute is storage capacity (col.4, line 45), wherein said interaction results in a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resource (user interaction with the system will cause for icons to be displayed in the nature sought by end user or default manufacture as respected realized (col.4, line 15); and in response to said interaction, restructuring said first mosaic-like pane by at least re-sizing said icons proportional to a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resources (col.4, lines 14-15, 34, 45 and 51), compared to a footprint of said at least one attribute prior to said interaction (col.6, lines 34-37); displaying attributes of said represented resource (col.6, line 7); and receiving changes to said attributes (col.5, line 66 and col.6, line 25); illustrating said attributes in a pop-up window(col.5, line 66); receiving a user indication through a peripheral device (col.5, line 66); receiving an indication of a new relationship developed between a resource of the

Art Unit: 2179

type represented in said second mosaic-like pane and the resources represented in said first mosaic-like pane (col.5, line 66 and col.4, line 14); and restructuring, in response to receiving said indication (col.6, line 7), said at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies and corresponding said first mosaic-like pane by at least re-sizing said icons proportional to a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resources (col.5, lines 1-5 (organizational structure) and col.4, lines 14, 31, 38, 44,-46 and 51), compared to a footprint of said at least one attribute prior to receiving said indication (col.6, lines 34-37); processing a drag-and-drop of at least one said independent icon from said second mosaic-like pane to said first mosaic-like pane (col.6, line 24); rejecting said processing of an invalid said drag-and-drop(col.6, line 35); displaying a pop-up window for receiving changes to said attributes (col.5, line 66); method of controlling the relationships amongst resources of a system (col.4, lines 54-55); manipulating a relationship of resources in said iconically illustrated system (col.4, lines 38); and re-sizing areas of, in response to said manipulating (col.4, line 43), the relative footprints of said icons according to an effect upon the corresponding resources, respectively, caused by the relationship manipulation (col.6, lines 25 and 33-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Jong to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus

Art Unit: 2179

presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Jong's organization of icons that show the relation of resources of a computer.

As for dependent claims 4-5 and 25, Jong teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising: arranging said icons representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicate relationships between particular resources of the respective column (figures 14-15); labeling said one of hierarchical columns and hierarchical rows with an indication of said at least one common feature (labels depicted in figures 14-15).

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action.

Art Unit: 2179

Storage area network administration		
TracM-task and resource automation for call center management		
Methods and apparatus for representing resources in a computing system environment		
Methods and apparatus for graphically managing resources		
Persistent usage context		
Information presentation system for a graphical user interface		
Graphical user interface shop floor control system		
Network management system and network status display method		
Interactive topology graphs for visualization and characterization of SONET consumption patterns		
Data processing apparatus, data processing method, and storage medium storing computer-readable program		
Representing a storage subsystem logical configuration in a graphical user Interface using a tree metaphor		
Configuration diagram which graphically displays program relationship		
Interactive hierarchical status display		

Art Unit: 2179

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N. Augustine

January 30, 2007

Nicholas Augustine

Examiner